

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/635,832	YAMAZAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Fernando L. Toledo	2823	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Fernando L. Toledo.

(3) _____.

(2) John Hayden.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 October 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 61.

Identification of prior art discussed: prior art of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued that the reference does not show impurities in the channel region. However, Examiner pointed out that the source and drain of the gate do diffuse to some extent into the channel region and therefore, those can be interpreted as several impurity regions in the channel region.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required